

as they were under the old regime. Behind the façade of proletarian rule the methods of fierce old Czars like Ivan the Terrible and Peter the Great are constantly peeping out. One is impressed by the prophetic wisdom of the Polish novelist, Joseph Conrad, who wrote in response to the Bolshevik Revolution:

“The ferocity and imbecility of an autocratic rule rejecting all legality and in fact basing itself upon complete moral anarchism provokes the no less imbecile and atrocious answer of a purely utopian revolutionism encompassing destruction by the first means to hand, in the strange conviction that a fundamental change of hearts must follow the downfall of any given human institutions. These people are unable to see that all they can effect is a mere change

of names. The oppressors and the oppressed are all Russians together; and the world is brought once more face to face with the truth of the saying that the tiger cannot change his stripes nor the leopard his spots.”

The negative lesson of the Bolshevik Revolution is the futility of expecting a change of hearts and minds from a change of external institutions, no matter how violent and sweeping. The positive lesson (and this applies also to the current fetish of salvation through institutionalism) is that the only true revolution lies in an inner change of hearts and minds. This, incidentally, is the common conviction of all the world's great religious and moral teachers, whose target is always the individual, never the institutions under which the individual lives. ♦



LEWIS LOVE

THERE ONCE lived a king in a distant land — a just and wise old king, for he had observed and learned much about his people and about himself and his power. His

Mr. Love is a businessman and Associate Editor of the Fort Worth, Texas Rotary Club's *Rotagraph*, where this article first appeared, March 16, 1962.

people were free to go their way, and were fearful of the king and his soldiers, for his rule granted no privilege to one that was not a privilege to all equally. And they were free to petition their king and seek his wisdom in their affairs.

Thus there came one day to the royal court an artisan, a mason, and a beggar who was lame.

"O great and wise king," they cried, "we are sorely troubled with our plight." "I," said the artisan, "make many useful goods. I use great skill and labor long, and yet when I am finished, the people will not pay my price."

"And I," said the mason, "am a layer of stone for houses and fine walls, yet I am idle, for no one gives me work."

"I am a poor lame beggar," said the third man, "who seeks alms from those who pass, as they find it in their hearts to do so, but alms are so few as to be of great concern lest I perish."

"I can see that your trouble is great," consoled the king, "and what would you ask of me?"

Then, they spoke as a group, the artisan, the mason, and the beg-

gar who was lame: "Your power is very great, our king, and you can make the people see the folly of their ways and aid us in our troubles."

"Perhaps," said the king, "perhaps my power is great, but I must use it wisely or it shall be lost." And he called to the captain of his guard.

"Bring forth three swords," he commanded, "one for each of these men, and instruct them in their use. These three shall go forth in the land and compel those who will not voluntarily deal with them to obey their command."

"No! no!" the three men called out, "this we did not ask. We are men of honor and could not set upon our fellow man to compel him to our will. This we cannot do. It is you, O king, who must use the power."

"You ask me to do that which you would not do because of honor?" questioned the king. "Is honor one thing to a beggar and another to a king? I, too, am an honorable man, and that which is dishonorable for you will never be less dishonorable for your king." ♦

# WHO CONSERVES OUR RESOURCES?

RUTH SHALLCROSS MAYNARD

“WHO SHOULD conserve our resources?” If a poll were taken, a large majority probably would answer: “Our federal and state governments.” And if one were to ask why this view is so widely held, he would find among other “reasons” the following:

(1) that the free market is chaotic, gives profits to the few, and is unmindful of the great “waste” of our diminishing limited resources;

(2) that “people’s rights” are above “private or special interests” and only the government can

properly serve the public interest;

(3) that government has access to more funds;

(4) that government has the power and facilities to obtain all the necessary data and to do the research needed for the best “scientific” decisions on resource conservation;

(5) that the price system does not operate in the interests of conservation because of the “unrestrained pursuit of self-interest”;

(6) that the concentration of power in some corporations further threatens our dwindling resources and must be regulated by government.

*Dr. Maynard is Assistant Professor of Economics, Lake Erie College, Painesville, Ohio.  
Illustration: A. Devaney, Inc., New York*